KEEGAN, WERLIN & PABIAN, LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW 265 FRANKLIN STREET BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02110-3113

TELECOPIERS:

(617) 951-1354

(617) 951-1400

(617) 951-0586

December 17, 2004

Mary L. Cottrell, Secretary Department of Telecommunication and Energy One South Station, 2nd Floor Boston, MA 02202

Re:

City of Cambridge, D.T.E. 04-65

Dear Secretary Cottrell:

Enclosed please find the responses of Cambridge Electric Light Company d/b/a NSTAR Electric ("NSTAR Electric" or the "Company") to discovery questions asked in the above-referenced proceeding, as listed on the following Discovery Log.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

John K. Habib

Enclosures

cc:

John Shortsleeve, Esq.

William Stevens, Hearing Officer

Sean Hanley, Rates and Revenues Requirements James Byrnes, Rates and Revenues Requirements Mark Barrett, Rates and Revenues Requirements

LOG OF RESPONSES FILED

D.T.E. 04-65

December 17, 2004

Response	Status	Attachments
		Attachment City-1-1(a) SENT VIA E-MAIL
City 1-1	Filed 12/14/2004 (a.m. filing)	Attachment City-1-1-(b) SENT VIA E-MAIL
City 1-2	Filed December 16, 2004	Attachment City-1-2 (a) SENT VIA E-MAIL Attachment City-1-2 (b) SENT VIA E-MAIL
City 1-2	The December 10, 2001	Attachment City-1-3(a) BULK
City 1-3	Filed 12/14/2004 (a.m. filing)	Attachment City-1-3(b)
City-1-4	Filed 12/14/2004 (p.m. filing)	
City-1-5	Filed 12/14/2004 (a.m. filing)	Attachment City-1-5
City-1-6	Filed December 15, 2004	
City-1-7	Filed Herewith	
City-1-8	Filed Herewith	
City-1-9	Filed Herewith	Attachment City-1-9
City-1-10	Filed December 15, 2004	
City-1-11	Filed 12/14/2004 (p.m. filing)	
City-1-12	Filed 12/14/2004 (p.m. filing)	
		Attachment City-1-13(a)
City-1-13	Filed Herewith	Attachment City-1-13(b)
City-1-14	Filed Herewith	
City-1-15	Filed Herewith	Attachment City-1-15
City-1-16	Filed Herewith	Attachment City-1-16
City-1-17	Filed Herewith	
City-1-18	Filed December 15, 2004	
City-1-19	Filed Herewith	
City-1-20	Filed December 15, 2004	
City-1-21	Filed Herewith	
City-1-22	Filed December 15, 2004	
City-1-23	Filed Herewith	
City-1-24	Filed Herewith	
City-1-25	Filed Herewith	
City-1-26	Filed Herewith	
City-1-27	Filed December 16, 2004	
City-1-28	Filed Herewith	
City-1-29	Filed December 16, 2004	
City-1-30	Filed Herewith	
City-1-31	Filed Herewith	Attachment City-1-31
City-1-32	Filed December 16, 2004	
City-1-33	Filed 12/14/2004 (p.m. filing)	

Response	Status	Attachments
City-1-34	Filed December 16, 2004	
City-1-35	Filed December 16, 2004	
City-1-36	Filed December 16, 2004	
City-1-37	Filed December 16, 2004	
City-1-38	Filed December 16, 2004	
City-1-39	Filed December 16, 2004	
City-1-40	Filed December 16, 2004	
City-1-41	Filed December 16, 2004	
City-1-42	Filed December 16, 2004	
City-1-43	Filed December 16, 2004	
City-1-44	Filed December 16, 2004	
City-1-45	Filed December 16, 2004	
DTE-1-1	Filed December 16, 2004	
DTE-1-2	Filed Herewith	
DTE-1-3	Filed Herewith	
DTE-1-4	Filed December 16, 2004	
DTE-1-5	Filed Herewith	Attachment DTE-1-5
DTE-1-6	Filed December 16, 2004	
DTE-1-7	Filed December 16, 2004	
DTE-1-8	Filed December 16, 2004	
DTE-1-9	Filed Herewith	
DTE-1-10	Filed Herewith	
DTE-1-11	Filed Herewith	Attachment DTE-1-11(a) Attachment DTE-1-11(b)

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-7

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request City 1-7

Please refer to the annual depreciation rates listed in column 6 of Exhibit CAM 5. Please confirm that the Company used the same streetlight specific depreciation rates listed in Exhibit CAM 5 to calculate annual streetlight depreciation expense. If there is any deviation from the depreciation rates listed in Exhibit CAM 5 and the depreciation rates used by the Company, to calculate annual depreciation expense, please provide the depreciation rates used by the Company and explain any such deviation from the depreciation rates listed in Exhibit CAM 5.

Response

The depreciation rates used on Exhibit CAM-5 were supplied by the Company for the period since 1973. The rates prior to that time are not readily available at this time. The Company has researched as far back as was possible for the period prior to 1973 using readily available records and personal knowledge. Based on that research, the Company believes that the rates listed in Exhibit CAM-5 prior to 1973 may not be exactly accurate, but are approximately correct. Additionally, the rate listed for years prior to 1999 are approximate composite values since the Company actually used a different rate for each sub-account when calculating depreciation expense. The following chart shows the Department-approved depreciation rate for each sub-account used during the 1992-1999 period.

C-1- A	Data
Sub-Account	<u>Rate</u>
373.71	7.27 percent
373.73	5.90 percent
373.74	3.24 percent
373.75	3.73 percent

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-8

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request City 1-8

Please refer to the annual depreciation expense listed in column 7 of Exhibit CAM 5. Please confirm that the Company calculated the same annual streetlight depreciation expense for each year since 1942. If there is any deviation from the depreciation expenses listed in Exhibit CAM 5 for each year since 1942 and the annual streetlight depreciation expenses calculated by the Company, please provide the annual depreciation expenses calculated by the Company and explain any such deviation from the values listed in Exhibit CAM 5.

Response

Please see the Company's response to Information Request City-1-7.

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-9
December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Page 1 of 2

Information Request City 1-9

Please refer to the annual accumulated depreciation expense listed in column 8 of Exhibit CAM 5. Please confirm that the Company calculated the same annual accumulated depreciation expense for each year since 1942. If there is any deviation from the accumulated depreciation expenses listed in Exhibit CAM 5 for each year since 1942 and the annual accumulated depreciation expenses calculated by the Company, please provide the annual accumulated depreciation expenses calculated by the Company and explain any such deviation.

Response

The Company does not agree with the accumulated depreciation listed in column 8 of Exhibit CAM-5. To illustrate the inaccuracy of the City's calculation, the following table compares the accumulated depreciation listed in column 8 of Exhibit CAM-5 to the accumulated depreciation balance used in the Company's base rate filings for the years 1973, 1978, 1986, 1991 and 2003 in Table 1 below. This shows that the accumulated depreciation values listed in Exhibit CAM-5 are significantly higher than those provided in Company records. This significantly understates the City's estimate of net book value.

Table 1					
Cambridge Street	lighting Equipment				
Year Col A	Plant Balance Col B	Book Depreciation Reserve Col C	Accumulated Depreciation Col E = CAM5 col 8	% Difference Col F=(Col E - Col C)/Col C	Source
Dec.31, 1973	1,224,658	360,746	612,154	70%	1973 Depreciation Study
Dec. 31, 1978	1,663,474	664,039	869,277	31%	1978 Depreciation Study
Dec. 31, 1986	2,265,549	726,802	1,173,043	61%	1986 Depreciation Study
Dec. 31, 1991	2,793,315	397,703	1,009,247	154%	1992 Depreciation Study
Jun. 30, 1992	2,890,496	468,810	1,000,002 est	113%	1992 Depreciation Study
Dec. 31, 2003	3,784,028	1,565,529	2,660,466	70%	From Company's Books

The deviation is caused, in most part, by the omission of critical variables in the calculation of accumulated depreciation. In order to properly calculate accumulated depreciation for a particular account, the Company must include more variables than the annual depreciation expense for such account. Specifically, the Company uses Department-approved depreciation rates, gross plant values, actual retirements, costs of removal and net salvage values as directed in the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 18, Chapter 1, Part 101 of the Uniform System of Accounts prescribed for Public Utilities, Balance Sheet Accounts, Accumulated Provision for Depreciation of Electric Utility Plant, to

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-9

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Page 2 of 2

determine accumulated depreciation. The Company's accumulated depreciation for a particular account is represented by the following algebraic expression:

 $DR_e = DR_b + (AGP * Rate) - RP - COR + SAL$

Where:

DR_e = Depreciation reserve ending balance

DR_b= Depreciation reserve beginning balance

AGP = Average Gross Plant

Rate = Department approved depreciation rate RP = Original Cost of plant retired in the period COR = Cost of Removal related to retired plant

SAL = Salvage value of plant retired

Please Refer to Attachment City-1-9 for a copy of the applicable page from the Code of Federal Regulations, 18 CFR, part 101, governing the amounts recorded in Account 108.

this account. Records must be maintained to show separately each project along with complete detail of the nature and purpose of the research, development, and demonstration project together with the related costs.

108 Accumulated provision for depreciation of electric utility plant (Major only).

A. This account shall be credited with the following:

(1) Amounts charged to account 403, Depreciation Expense, or to clearing accounts for current depreciation expense for electric plant in service.

- (2) Amounts charged to account 421, Miscellaneous Nonoperating Income. for depreciation expense on property included in account 105, Electric Plant Held for Future Use. Include, also, the balance of accumulated provision for depreciation on property when transferred to account 105, Electric Plant Held for Future Use, from other property accounts. Normally account 108 will not be used for current depreciation provisions because, as provided herein, the service life during which depreciation is computed commences with the date property is includible in electric plant in service; however, if special circumstances indicate the propriety of current accruals for depreciation, such charges shall be made to account 421, Miscellaneous Nonoperating Income.
- (3) Amounts charged to account 413, Expenses of Electric Plant Leased to Others, for electric plant included in account 104, Electric Plant Leased to Others.
- (4) Amounts charged to account 416, Costs and Expenses of Merchandising, Jobbing, and Contract Work, or to clearing accounts for current depreciation expense.
- (5) Amounts of depreciation applicable to electric properties acquired as operating units or systems. (See electric plant instruction 5.)
- (6) Amounts charged to account 182, Extraordinary Property Losses, when authorized by the Commission.
- (7) Amounts of depreciation applicable to electric plant donated to the utility.

(The utility shall maintain separate subaccounts for depreciation applicable

to electric plant in service, electric plant leased to others and electric plant held for future use.)

- B. At the time of retirement of depreciable electric utility plant, this account shall be charged with the book cost of the property retired and the cost of removal and shall be credited with the salvage value and any other amounts recovered, such as insurance, When retirement, costs of removal and salvage are entered originally in retirement work orders, the net total of such work orders may be included in a separate subaccount hereunder. Upon completion of the work order, the proper distribution to subdivisions of this account shall be made as provided in the following paragraph.
- C. For general ledger and balance sheet purposes, this account shall be regarded and treated as a single composite provision for depreciation. For purposes of analysis, however, each utility shall maintain subsidiary records in which this account is segregated according to the following functional classification for electric plant: (1) Steam production, (2) Nuclear production, (3) Hydraulic production, (4) Other production, (5) Transmission, (6) Distribution, and (7) General. These subsidiary records shall reflect the current credits and debits to this account in sufficient detail to show separately for each such functional classification (a) the amount of accrual for depreciation, (b) the book cost of property retired, (c) cost of removal, (d) salvage, and (e) other items, including recoveries from insurance.
- D. When transfers of plant are made from one electric plant account to another, or from or to another utility department, or from or to nonutility property accounts, the accounting for the related accumulated provision for depreciation shall be as provided in electric plant instruction 12.
- E. The utility is restricted in its use of the accumulated provision for depreciation to the purposes set forth above. It shall not transfer any portion of this account to retained earnings or make any other use thereof without authorization by the Commission.

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-13

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Page 1 of 2

Information Request City 1-13

Please provide a calculation of the unamortized investment of the streetlight plant in Cambridge using the method approved in DTE 98-89, as used by NSTAR to calculate the streetlight unamortized value in Lexington. Please present the DTE 98-89 calculation, prepared in response to this question for each year since 1942, with columns similar to the 11-column format used by Mr. Chernick in Exhibit CAM-5. Please explain any differences between the DTE 98-89 calculation prepared by the Company and the calculation demonstrated by Mr. Chernick in Exhibit CAM-5.

Response

The method used by Boston Edison in calculating its price for streetlights in the D.T.E. 98-89 has no bearing on the facts of this case. Unlike Boston Edison Company's records regarding Lexington, Cambridge Electric Light Company (the "Company") has records for depreciation expense, retirements, cost of removal and salvage specific to the City of Cambridge, because the City is the Company's sole municipal customer. Since the Company serves only one municipality, there is no reason to construct an artificial depreciation reserve as was necessary for Boston Edison Company to calculate a price for streetlights in Lexington. Thus, the methodology used to calculate prices for streetlights for Lexington in D.T.E. 98-89 is inapplicable to this case. Moreover, the methodology used in D.T.E. 98-89 was arrived at via a settlement of the parties to that proceeding, and as such, has no precedential value.

However, in order to be responsive to the City's request, please see Attachment City-1-13(a) for the requested information. It was not possible to precisely replicate the requested calculation because, although Cambridge has records for retirements and additions to streetlighting as a whole, it does not have the records to associate its annual retirements and additions to individual sub-accounts. Thus, the attached calculation assumed that all activity occurred in sub-account 635. Additionally, the methodology used in D.T.E. 98-89 did not include transfers and adjustments. These values have been added into the requested calculation. The Company notes that the results of the requested calculation (a project total book value of \$1,109,680 as of December 31, 2003) when compared to the actual amount on the Company's books of \$2,218,498 as shown on Exhibit NSTAR-1 proves that the artificial methodology used in D.T.E. 98-89 and in D.T.E. 02-11 does not adequately compensate the Company for the actual unamortized investment of its streetlights.

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-13

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Page 2 of 2

Additionally, to show the effect of ignoring negative salvage costs on the streetlight valuation, the Company is providing a second version of this calculation as Attachment City-1-13(b) which includes negative salvage costs. This version results in a total streetlight value of \$2,053,105. This results in a valuation that is nearly twice the incorrect version in Attachment City-1-13(a), and much closer to the Company's actual net book value.

ment City-1-13(a)	D.T.E. 04-65	Page 1 of 3
Attachi		

				Page
	Gross	Accumulated	Net	
Category	Investment	Depreciation	Investment	ent
Account 632 Street Light OH Conductors				
Account 633 Street Light UG Conduit				
Account 634 Street Light UG Conductors				
Account 635 Municipal posts, fixtures, luminaires	3,783,578.31	2,673,898.04	1,109,	1,109,680.27
Account 636 Commercial posts, fixtures, luminaires				
Account 637 Outdoor Street Light Transformers and control equipment				
Waltham CCNC				1
Total before allocations	3,783,578.31	2,673,898.04	1,109,	1,109,680.27
Step 1. Allocate CCNC				
Total allocation accounts 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637.				
Waltham CCNC to be allocated over above accounts	00.0	0.00		
A occumt 622 Street I ight OH Conductors				
Account 633 Street Light UG Conduit				
Account 634 Street Light UG Conductors				
Account 635 Municipal posts, fixtures, luminaires	3,783,578.31	2,673,898.04	1,109,	1,109,680.27
Account 636 Commercial posts, fixtures, luminaires				
Account 637 Outdoor Street Light Transformers and control equipment				
Waltham CCNC				
CCNC Allocation of accounts Subtotal	3,783,578.31	2,673,898.04	1,109,	1,109,680.27

	969				
Sept 2. Allocate accounts 632, 633, 634, 63/ 10 633 and 636 Allocation Total for 632, 633, 634, 637 Total 635, 636		0.00	0.00		
Account 632 Street Light OH Conductors Account 633 Street Light UG Conduit Account 634 Street Light UG Conductors Account 635 Municipal posts, fixtures, luminaires Account 636 Commercial posts, fixtures, luminaires		3,783,578.31	2,673,898.04	1,109,680.27	0.00
Account 637 Outdoor Street Light Transformers and control equipment Subtotal		3,783,578.31	2,673,898.04	1,109,680.27	10.27
Step 3. Allocate account 637 to Commercial / Non-Commercial Account 632 Street Light OH Conductors Account 633 Street Light UG Conduit Account 634 Street Light UG Conductors	mercial				
Account 635 Municipal posts, fixtures, luminaires Account 636 Commercial posts, fixtures, luminaires	ntrol equipment	3,681,866.31	2,673,898.04	1,109,680.27	80.27
Account 65/ Outdoor Street Light Mansion mers and co		3,681,866.31	2,673,898.04	1,109,680.27	30.27
Walifiam Concounting and		515,461.28	374,345.73	155,3	155,355.24
Account 655 MDC/Commercial usage		3,166,405.03	2,299,552.32	954,2	954,325.03
I otal City investment					

Total City Investment

YEAR	Additions	ght Equipment Retirements	Transfers	Adjustments	Net Balance	Avg. Balance	Depr. Rate	Depr/ Exp.	Neg. Salv.	Accum. Depr.
IEAR	Additions		Transiers	1 kajusationas	376,009.00					
942	2,017	(2,979)			375,047.76	375,528.38	6.46%	24,259.13		209,284.99
1943	1,907	(14,513)		(1,036)	361,405.94	368,226.85	6.46%	23,787.45		218,559.81
944	3,542	(2,943)		31	362,035.66	361,720.80	6.46%	23,367.16		238,983.84 258,839.48
1945	3,152	(3,528)		262	361,921.85	361,978.76	6.46%	23,383.83		274,447.56
1946	14,515	(7,941)		(1,353)	367,143.39	364,532.62	6.46% 6.46%	23,548.81 24,587.47		272,778.90
1947	53,139	(26,256)		52	394,078.50	380,610.95 397,984.80	6.46%	25,709.82		286,648.56
1948	19,653	(11,840)		<u></u>	401,891.10 424.963,16	413,427.13	6.46%	26,707.39		289,474.31
1949	46,954 11,550	(23,882) (5,015)			424,903.10	428,230.67	6.46%	27,663.70		312,122.60
1950	17,436	(7,409)			441,524.90	436,511.54	6.46%	28,198.65		332,912.24
1951	9,066	(3,914)		-	446,676.78	444,100.84	6.46%	28,688.91		357,686.81
1952 1953	22,698	(6,880)			462,495.27	454,586.03	6.46%	29,366.26		380,173.07
1954	9,154	(4,062)			467,587.35	465,041.31	6.46%	30,041.67		406,152.37
1955	11,695	(5,507)			473,775.90	470,681.63	6.46%	30,406.03		431,051.63
1956	8,584	(2,536)			479,823.93	476,799.92	6.46%	30,801.27		459,316.55
1957	5,220	(2,789)	(171,432)		310,822.97	395,323.45	6.46%	25,537.89		482,065.88
1958	40,456	(4,314)	(346,964.62	328,893.80	6.46%	21,246.54		498,998.31
1959	36,624	(21,227)			362,361.70	354,663.16	6.46%	22,911.24		500,682.63
1960	62,238	(17,972)			406,627.43	384,494.57	6.46%	24,838.35		507,549.15
1961	20,861	(8,262)	26,707		445,932.79	426,280.11	6.46%	27,537.70		526,824.38
1962	94,215	(28,278)	(541)	-	511,328.97	478,630.88	6.46%	30,919.55		529,465.62
1963	64,025	(27,539)			547,814,47	529,571.72	6.46%	34,210.33		536,136.85
1964	48,324	(19,182)			576,642.96	562,228.72	6.46%	36,319.97		553,275.16
1965	127,949	(38,570)	(139)		665,883.32	621,263.14	6.46%	40,133.60	ļ	554,838.76
1966	64,709	(16,589)			714,003.82	689,943.57	6.46%	44,570.35		582,820.26
1967	116,319	(57,960)			772,362.63	743,183.23	6.46%			572,869.87
1968	224,190	(102,473)	(29)		894,050.61	833,206.62	6.46%			524,221.69
1969	68,046	(31,498)	(2,470))	928,129.31	911,089.96	6.46%			551,580.53
1970	241,914	(78,484)	46	62	1,091,667.31	1,009,898.31	6.46%			538,335.96
1971	94,239	(37,271)	(126))	1,148,509.31	1,120,088.31	6.46%			573,422.66
1972	130,277	(83,486)	(170)		1,195,130.31	1,171,819.81	6.46%			565,636,22
1973	61,329	(31,642)		(162) 1,224,655.31	1,209,892.81	6.46%			612,153.30
1974	49,566			(103) 1,250,761.31	1,237,708.31	6.46%			668,752,26
1975	60,338	(45,976)			1,264,990.31	1,257,875.81	6.46%		<u> </u>	704,035.03
1976	110,149			98,890		1,430,436.31		-1		752,973.22
1977	43,625)	1,619,468.31	1,607,675.31				813,694.98
1978	70,497				1,663,472.31	1,641,470.31				869,275.50
1979	59,088)	1,693,237.31	1,678,354.81	1	83,917.74 85,400.57		930,272.24 995,422.81
1980	49,798		·		1,722,785.31	1,708,011.31	I	85,400.57 87,309.09		1,053,370.90
1981	76,333)	1,769,578.31	1,746,181.81		6 92,237.24		1,081,255.14
1982	214,686				1,919,911.31			6 98,892.22		1,139,513.35
1983	157,247)	2,035,777.31			6 103,594.42		1,157,883.77
1984	157,440			 	2,107,999.31			6 106,757.64		1,157,055.41
1985	161,89.				2,162,306.31			6 99,626.73		1,173,041.14
1986	186,883			3	2,326,061.31	 		6 103,311.22		1,191,549.3
1987	145,342				2,379,074.31	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		6 105,865.55		1,217,273.9
1988	134,22			"	2,379,074.31			6 109,578.14		1,233,582.0
1989	205,26		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>	2,640,969.31			6 115,470.78		1,109,050.8
1990	395,16: 418,09				2,793,313.31			6 165,745.62		1,009,245.4
1991					2,993,919.31	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		6 182,008.47		990,754.9
1992	400,36			<u> </u>	3,110,811.31			6 191,993.78		996,038.6
1993	286,34			5	3,295,335.31			6 201,473.3		1,094,952.0
1994 1995	124,45				3,323,428.31			6 208,160.12		1,205,611.1
1	293,33			-	3,532,601.31			6 215,622.1		1,337,067.2
1996	258,43				3,695,665.31			227,328.9		1,469,024.2
1997	107,51			 	3,713,189.31			6 233,008.4		1,612,044.7
1998	107,31				3,752,402.31			234,792.8		1,785,732.5
	68,43				3,787,541.31			% 237,131.2		1,989,570.7
2000	7,56				3,793,354.3			% 238,419.1		2,226,235.9
2001	6,52				3,795,700.3			238,675.7		2,460,729.7
2002	13,07			-	3,783,578.3			% 238,368.3		2,673,898.0

ment City-1-13(b)	D.T.E. 04-65	Page 1 of 3
Attach		

	Gross	Accumulated	Net
Category	Investment	Depreciation	Investment
Account 632 Street Light OH Conductors Account 633 Street Light UG Conduit			
Account 635 Municipal posts, fixtures, luminaires Account 636 Commercial posts, fixtures, luminaires	3,783,578.31	1,730,472.90	2,053,105.41
Account 637 Outdoor Street Light Transformers and control equipment	introl equipment		
Waitham CCINC Total before allocations	3,783,578.31	1,730,472.90	2,053,105.41
Step 1. Allocate CCNC Total allocation accounts 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637.			
Waltham CCNC to be allocated over above accounts	00'0	0.00	
Account 632 Street Light OH Conductors Account 633 Street Light UG Conduit			
Account 634 Street Light UG Conductors Account 635 Municipal posts, fixtures, luminaires	3,783,578.31	1,730,472.90	2,053,105.41
Account 636 Commercial posts, fixtures, luminaires Account 637 Outdoor Street Light Transformers and control equipment	ontrol equipment		
Waltham CCNC CCNC Allocation of accounts Subtotal	3,783,578.31	1,730,472.90	2,053,105.41

0.00	06		2,90 2,053,105.41	0.00	90 2,053,105.41		90 2,053,105.41		90 2,053,105.41	.21 287,434.76	.70 1,765,670.65
6	1,730,472.90		1,730,472.90		1,730,472.90		1,730,472.90		1,730,472.90	242,266.21	1,488,206.70
0.00	3,783,578.31		3,783,578.31	0.00	3,783,578.31		3,681,866.31		3,681,866.31	515,461.28	3,166,405.03
nd 636				ontrol equipment		nmercial		ontrol equipment			
Sept 2. Allocate accounts 632, 633, 634, 637 to 635 and 636 Allocation Total for 632, 633, 634, 637		Account 632 Street Light OH Conductors Account 633 Street Light UG Conduit Account 634 Street Light UG Conductors	Account 635 Municipal posts, fixtures, luminaires	Account 636 Commercial posts, fixtures, luminaires		Step 3. Allocate account 637 to Commercial / Non-Commercial Account 632 Street Light OH Conductors Account 633 Street Light UG Conduit	Account 634 Street Light UG Conductors Account 635 Municipal posts, fixtures, luminaires Account 636 Commercial posts, fixtures, luminaires	Account 637 Outdoor Street Light Transformers and control equipment	Waltham CCNC Subtotal after allocations	Account 635 MDC/Commercial usage	Total City Investment

AR	Additions	nt Equipment Retirements	Transfers	Adjustments	Net Balance	Avg. Balance	Depr. Rate	Depr/ Exp.	Neg. Salv.	Accum. Depr.
					376,009.00 375,047.76	375,528.38	6.46%	24,259.13	(447)	208,838.20
2	2,017	(2,979)		(1,036)	361,405.94	368,226.85	6.46%	23,787.45	(2,177)	215,936.12
3	1,907	(14,513)		31	362,035.66	361,720.80	6.46%	23,367.16	(441)	235,918.68
4	3,542	(2,943)		262	361,921.85	361,978.76	6.46%	23,383.83	(529)	255,245.09
5	3,152	(3,528)		(1,353)	367,143,39	364,532.62	6.46%	23,548.81	(1,191)	269,662.06
16	14,515 53,139	(26,256)		52	394,078,50	380,610.95	6.46%	24,587.47	(3,938)	264,054.99
17 18	19,653	(11,840)			401,891.10	397,984.80	6.46%	25,709.82	(1,776)	276,148.62
9	46,954	(23,882)			424,963,16	413,427.13	6.46%	26,707.39	(3,582)	275,392.13
50	11,550	(5,015)			431,498.18	428,230,67	6.46%	27,663.70	(752)	297,288.09
51	17,436	(7,409)			441,524.90	436,511.54	6.46%	28,198.65	(1,111)	316,966.39
52	9,066	(3,914)			446,676.78	444,100.84	6.46%	28,688.91	(587)	341,153.80
53	22,698	(6,880)			462,495.27	454,586.03	6.46%	29,366,26	(1,032)	362,608.07
54	9,154	(4,062)			467,587.35	465,041.31	6.46%	30,041.67	(609)	387,978.01
55	11,695	(5,507)			473,775.90	470,681.63	6.46%	30,406.03	(826)	412,051.26
56	8,584	(2,536)		<u> </u>	479,823.93	476,799.92	6.46%	30,801,27	(380)	439,935.72
57	5,220	(2,789)	(171,432)	310,822.97	395,323.45	6.46%	25,537.89	(418)	462,266.77
58	40,456	(4,314)			346,964.62	328,893.80	6.46%	21,246.54	(647)	478,552.09
59	36,624	(21,227)			362,361.70	354,663.16	6.46%		(3,184)	477,052.3
60	62,238	(17,972)			406,627.43	384,494.57	6.46%		(2,696)	
61	20,861	(8,262)	26,707		445,932.79	426,280.11	6.46%		(1,239)	
62	94,215	(28,278)	(541)	511,328.97	478,630.88	6.46%		(4,242) (4,131)	497,658.4 500,198.8
63	64,025	(27,539)			547,814.47	529,571.72	6.46%		(2,877)	
64	48,324	(19,182)			576,642.96	562,228.72	6.46%	+	(5,786)	
65	127,949	(38,570)	(139)	665,883.32	621,263.14	6.46%		(2,488)	
966	64,709	(16,589)			714,003.82	689,943,57	6.46%		(8,694)	
967	116,319	(57,960)			772,362.63	743,183.23	6.46%		(15,371)	
968	224,190	(102,473)		·	894,050.61	833,206.62	6.46%			
969	68,046	(31,498)			928,129.31	911,089.96	6.46%	+	(4,725)	′
970	241,914	(78,484)				1,009,898.31	6.46%			<u> </u>
971	94,239	(37,271)			1,148,509.31	1,120,088.31	6.46%			
972	130,277	(83,486)			1,195,130.31		6.46%			
973	61,329	(31,642)		(162						
974	49,566	(23,357		(103			6.46%			
975	60,338	(45,976			1,264,990.31				 	
976	110,149	(43,468					- 000			
977	43,625	(19,662		/)	1,619,468.31				(2.0-	
978	70,497	(26,493			1,663,472.31				78 181	
1979	59,088			2)	1,693,237.31					
1980	49,798				1,722,785.31					
1981	76,333			9)	1,769,578.3			6 92,237.24		
1982	214,686			_\	1,919,911.3			6 98,892.2		
1983	157,247			7)	2,035,777.3	1		% 103,594.4		
1984	157,446				2,107,999.3			6 106,757.6		
1985	161,893				2,162,306.3			% 99,626.7		
1986	186,883				2,265,548.3			% 103,311.2		
1987	145,342			26)	2,326,061.3			% 105,865.5		
1988	134,227			ا(د	2,379,074.3			% 109,578.1		
1989	205,26				2,491,065.3 2,640,969.3		1.50	% 115,470.7		
1990	395,16				2,640,969.3			% 165,745.6		
1991	418,094		<u> </u>	99)	2,793,313.3			% 182,008.4	_	
1992	400,36			36				% 191,993.7		
1993	303,60			25	3,110,811.3		5.00	% 201,473.3	_	
1994	286,34			35				% 208,160.		
1995	124,45			+0	3,323,428.3			% 215,622.		_^
1996	293,33				3,695,665.3		6.00	% 227,328.		
1997	258,43							233,008.		
1998	107,51				3,713,189.3			234,792.		
1999	100,31				3,752,402.			237,131.		
2000	68,43			-	3,787,541.			9% 238,419.		
2001					3,793,354.			9% 238,675.		
2002					3,795,700.			9% 238,873. 9% 238,368.		
0007	13,07	8 (25,20	0)		3,783,578.	31 3,789,639.	0.2	z /0 Z36,308.	11,0	
2003										

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-14
December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request City 1-14

Please provide the calculation of the unamortized investment of the total streetlight plant in Cambridge using the method used by NSTAR in calculating the unamortized value of the total streetlight plant in Waltham, which occurred several months after the ruling in DTE 01-25. Please present that calculation in the same 11 column format used by Mr. Chernick in Exhibit CAM 5. If the same method was used for both Lexington and Waltham, a statement to that effect would be responsive to this question.

Response

The Waltham decision is relevant only to how depreciation reserve is allocated to sub-accounts under the method used for Lexington. As discussed in the Company's response to Information Request City-1-13, the Company did not create an artificial reserve balance for each sub-account to calculate Cambridge's price for streetlights.

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-15

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request City 1-15

For each year since 1942, please provide for account 373 the year-end and average gross plant balance, the annual depreciation expense, the accumulated depreciation balance, and net plant.

Response

Please refer to Attachment City-1-15 for the requested information. This calculation is based on the City's Exhibit CAM-5, but corrects for the apparent omission of Salvage and Cost of Removal from the City's calculations. responding to this question, the Company used actual negative net salvage for the years 1989-2004, and an estimated rate of 15 percent negative net salvage value in earlier years, based on the Department-approved 15 percent negative net salvage rate (see D.P.U. 92-250, at 70, a copy of which as been provided as Attachment Please note that the resulting accumulated depreciation as of December 31, 2003 on Attachment City-1-15 of \$2,346,142 does not tie exactly to Column E, line 284 of Exhibit NSTAR-1, which is \$2,218,498. However, this minor variance of 5.8 percent indicates that once the City's calculations have been corrected for the inclusion of salvage and the cost of removal, there is a very close correlation between the actual amounts on the Company's books and the City's theoretical calculation. The validity of this revised calculation can also be seen by comparing the calculated reserve in each year with the amounts approved by the Department in each of the Company's past rate cases as follows:

<u>Year</u>	Rate Case	As Calculated	<u>Difference</u>	Percent
1973	863,912	911,009	47,097	5.5%
1978	999,435	1,116,547	117,112	11.7%
1986	1,538,747	1,482,953	(55,794)	(3.6%)
1991	2,421,686	2,394,120	(27,566)	(1.1%)

Attachment City-1-15 also reflects actual additions of \$13,078 and retirements of \$25,200 during the year 2003.

			A	commission Del	preciation of S	treet Light a	ina Signai Syst		Attachment City	
	4 1 1 1 1 1	To art and a	Tr	A 15				reciation		Net Plant
Year	Additions	Retirements	Transfers	Adjustment	Balance	Rate	Annual	Neg. Salvage	Accumulated	System
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]	[9]	[10]
ining Ba					376,009		-		8	376,001
1942	2,017	(2,979)			375,048	6.46%	24,259	(447)	20,842	354,206
1943	1,907	(14,513)		(1,036)	361,406	6.46%	23,787	(2,177)	27,940	333,467
1944	3,542	(2,943)		31	362,036	6.46%	23,367	(441)	47,922	314,114
1945	3,152	(3,528)		262	361,922	6.46%	23,384	(529)	67,249	294,674
1946	14,515	(7,941)		(1,353)	367,144	6.46%	23,549	(1,191)	81,666	285,478
1947	53,139	(26,256)		52	394,079	6.46%	24,588	(3,938)	76,059	318,021
1948	19,653			32	401,892	6.46%	25,710	(1,776)	88,152	
	•	(11,840)			•				•	313,740
1949	46,954	(23,882)			424,964	6.46%	26,707	(3,582)	87,396	337,568
1950	11,550	(5,015)			431,499	6.46%	27,664	(752)	109,292	322,207
1951	17,436	(7,409)			441,526	6.46%	28,199	(1,111)	128,970	312,555
1952	9,066	(3,914)			446,677	6.46%	28,689	(587)	153,158	293,520
1953	22,698	(6,880)			462,496	6.46%	29,366	(1,032)	174,612	287,884
1954	9,154	(4,062)			467,588	6.46%	30,042	(609)	199,982	267,606
1955	11,695	(5,507)			473,777	6.46%	30,406	(826)	224,055	249,721
1956	8,584	(2,536)			479,825	6.46%	30,801	(380)	251,940	227,885
1957	5,220	(2,789)	(171,432)		310,823	6.46%	25,538	(418)	274,271	36,553
			(171,432)							56,409
1958	40,456	(4,314)			346,965	6.46%	21,247	(647)	290,556	
1959	36,624	(21,227)			362,362	6.46%	22,911	(3,184)	289,057	73,306
1960	62,238	(17,972)			406,628	6.46%	24,838	(2,696)	293,227	113,401
1961	20,861	(8,262)	26,707		445,933	6.46%	27,538	(1,239)	311,263	134,670
1962	94,215	(28,278)	(541)		511,329	6.46%	30,920	(4,242)	309,663	201,667
1963	64,025	(27,539)			547,815	6.46%	34,210	(4,131)	312,203	235,612
1964	48,324	(19,182)	(314)		576,643	6.46%	36,320	(2,877)	326,464	250,179
1965	127,949	(38,570)	(139)		665,884	6.46%	40,134	(5,786)	322,242	343,641
1966	64,709	(16,589)	(.57)		714,004	6.46%	44,570	(2,488)	347,736	366,269
1967		(57,960)			772,363	6.46%	48,010	(8,694)	329,091	443,272
	116,319		(20)							
1968	224,190	(102,473)	(29)		894,051	6.46%	53,825	(15,371)	265,072	628,979
1969	68,046	(31,498)	(2,470)		928,130	6.46%	58,856	(4,725)	287,706	640,424
1970	241,914	(78,484)	46	62	1,091,668	6.46%	65,239	(11,773)	262,689	828,979
1971	94,239	(37,271)	(126)		1,148,510	6.46%	72,358	(5,591)	292,185	856,325
1972	130,277	(83,486)	(170)		1,195,131	6.46%	75,700	(12,523)	271,876	923,255
1973	61,329	(31,642)	` ,	(162)	1,224,656	6.46%	78,159	(4,746)	313,647	911,009
1974	49,566	(23,357)		(103)	1,250,762	6.46%	79,956	(3,504)	366,742	884,020
1975	60,338	(45,976)	(133)	(105)	1,264,991	6.46%	81,259	(6,896)	395,129	869,862
				00 900					-	
1976	110,149	(43,468)	165,321	98,890	1,595,883	6.46%	92,406	(6,520)	437,547	1,158,336
1977	43,625	(19,662)	(377)		1,619,469	5.00%	80,384	(2,949)	495,319	1,124,150
1978	70,497	(26,493)			1,663,473	5.00%	82,074	(3,974)	546,926	1,116,547
1979	59,088	(22,921)	(6,402)		1,693,238	5.00%	83,918	(3,438)	604,484	1,088,754
1980	49,798	(20,250)			1,722,786	5.00%	85,401	(3,038)	666,597	1,056,188
1981	76,333	(29,361)	(179)		1,769,579	5.00%	87,309	(4,404)	720,141	1,049,437
1982	214,686	(64,353)	` ′		1,919,912	5.00%	92,237	(9,653)	738,373	1,181,539
1983	157,247	(40,634)	(747)		2,035,778	5.00%	98,892	(6,095)	790,536	1,245,242
1984	157,446	(85,224)	(, ,,,		2,108,000	5.00%	103,594	(12,784)	796,123	1,311,877
1985	161,893	(107,586)			2,162,307	5.00%	106,758	(16,138)	779,156	1,383,150
1986	186,883	(83,641)			2,265,549	4.50%	99,627	(12,546)	782,596	1,482,953
1987	145,342	(84,803)	(26)		2,326,062	4.50%	103,311	(12,720)	788,384	1,537,678
1988	134,227	(80,141)	(1,073)		2,379,075	4.50%	105,866	(12,021)	802,087	1,576,988
1989	205,261	(93,270)			2,491,066	4.50%	109,578	(13,991)	804,405	1,686,661
1990	395,165	(240,002)	(5,259)		2,640,970	4.50%	115,471	(36,000)	643,873	1,997,096
1991	418,094	(265,551)	(199)		2,793,314	6.10%	165,746	(39,833)	504,235	2,289,078
1992	400,369		736		2,993,920	6.29%	182,008	(190,045)	295,700	2,698,220
1993	303,602		,,,,		3,110,812	6.29%	191,994	(111,489)	189,495	2,921,317
		, , ,	73.6							
1994	286,349		735		3,295,336	6.29%	201,473	(83,026)	205,382	3,089,954
1995	124,454		1,140		3,323,429	6.29%	208,160	(53,603)	262,438	3,060,991
1996	293,339				3,532,602	6.29%	215,622	(83,536)	310,358	3,222,243
1997	258,436	(95,372)			3,695,666	6.29%	227,329	(17,141)	425,174	3,270,491
1998	107,512				3,713,190	6.29%	233,009	(33,630)	534,565	3,178,625
1999	100,318				3,752,403	6.29%	234,793	(24,962)	683,291	3,069,112
2000	68,432				3,787,542	6.29%	237,131	(15,619)	871,510	2,916,032
2001	7,567				3,793,355	6.29%	238,419	(10,496)	1,097,679	2,695,676
								• • •		
2002	6,528				3,795,701	6.29%	238,676	(1,481)	1,330,692	2,465,009
2003	13,078				3,783,579	6.29%	238,368	(1,382)	1,542,478	2,241,100
nid-200	6,539	(12,600)			3,777,518	6.29%	118,898	(22,717)	1,626,060	2,151,458

[1]-[4] From CELCo CambridgeStLt_ADDS_RETRES2adj_transf.xls 2003 [1] from CLECo CambridgeDec03.xls,[2] = avg 2000-02; 2004 = half of 2003

^[5] Previous year's [5] + current year's [1] through [4]; Beginning Balance from CELCo file CambridgeStLt_ADDS_RETRES2adj_transf.xls

^[6] From J Stephens email to J Shortsleeve, 28 May 2004 for 1973, 1978, 1986, 1991, 1992 (investment-weighted average of sub-account rates) and 2000; other years extrapolated and interpolated

^{[7] [6] ×} average of [5] for current and previous year
[8] Actual negative net salvage for the years 1992-2004. Prior to 1992 based on a 15% of retirments for each year. (15% Negative net Selvage approved DTE rate)

^[9] Previous year's [9] + current year's [2] and [7] and [8]

^{[10] [5]+[9]}

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-16

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request City 1-16

Please provide Additions, Retirements, Transfers, Adjustment, and Balance by year from 1942 through September 30, 2004, consistent with the data used in Exhibit NSTAR-2.

Response

Attachment City-1-16 shows additions retirements, adjustments and plant balances by year from 1942 through September 30, 2004. As further discussed in the Company's responses to Information Requests DTE-1-1 and City-1-29, the Accumulated Depreciation balance on Exhibit NSTAR-2 is the total accumulated depreciation as of September 30, 2004, which has then been allocated to the individual vintage years for purposes of allocating the total streetlighting investment to the private, City and MDC lights.

Attachment City-1-16

Cambridge Electric Light Company; Account 373 Street Light and Signal Systems

Year	Additions	Retirements		Adjustment	Balance
Beginning B	alance	[2]	[3]	141	[5] 376,009
 1942	2,017	(2,979)			375,048
1943	1,907	(14,513)		(1,036)	361,406
1944	3,542	(2,943)		31	362,036
1945	3,152	(3,528)		262	361,922
1946	14,515	(7,941)		(1,353)	367,144
1947	53,139	(26,256)		52	394,079
1948	19,653	(11,840)			401,892
1949	46,954	(23,882)			424,964
1950	11,550	(5,015)			431,499
1951	17,436	(7,409)			441,526
1952	9,066	(3,914)			446,677
1953	22,698	(6,880)			462,496
1954	9,154	(4,062)			467,588
1955	11,695	(5,507)			473,777
1956	8,584	(2,536)			479,825
1957	5,220	(2,789)	(171,432)		310,823
1958	40,456	(4,314)			346,965
1959	36,624	(21,227)			362,362
1960	62,238	(17,972)	27.707		406,628
1961	20,861	(8,262)	26,707 (541)		445,933 511,329
1962 1963	94,215 64,025	(28,278) (27,539)	(341)		547,815
1964	48,324	(19,182)	(314)		576,643
1965	127,949	(38,570)	(139)		665,884
1966	64,709	(16,589)	(132)		714,004
1967	116,319	(57,960)			772,363
1968	224,190	(102,473)	(29)		894,051
1969	68,046	(31,498)	(2,470)		928,130
1970	241,914	(78,484)	46	62	1,091,668
1971	94.239	(37,271)	(126)		1,148,510
1972	130,277	(83,486)	(170)		1,195,131
1973	61,329	(31,642)		(162)	1,224,656
1974	49,566	(23,357)		(103)	1,250,762
1975	60,338	(45,976)	(133)		1,264,991
1976	110,149	(43,468)	165,321	98,890	1,595,883
1977	43,625	(19,662)	(377)		1,619,469
1978	70,497	(26,493)			1,663,473
1979	59,088	(22,921)	(6,402)		1,693,238
1980	49,798	(20,250)	(170)		1,722,786
1981	76,333	(29,361)	(179)		1,769,579 1,919,912
1982	214,686	(64,353)	(242)		, -
1983 1984	157,247 157,446	(40,634) (85,224)	(747)		2,035,778 2,108,000
1985	161,893	(107,586)			2,162,307
1986	186,883	(83,641)			2,265,549
1987	145,342	(84,803)	(26)		2,326,062
1988	134,227	(80,141)	(1,073)		2,379,075
1989	205,261	(93,270)	(-,/		2,491,066
1990	395,165	(240,002)	(5,259)	,	2,640,970
1991	418,094	(265,551)	(199)		2,793,314
1992	400,369	(200,499)	736		2,993,920
1993	303,602	(186,710)			3,110,812
1994	286,349	(102,560)	735		3,295,336
1995	124,454	(97,501)	1,140		3,323,429
1996	293,339	(84,166)			3,532,602
1997	258,436	(95,372)			3,695,666
1998	107,512	(89,988)			3,713,190
1999	100,318	(61,105)			3,752,403
2000	68,432	(33,293)			3,787,542
2001	7,567	(1,754)			3,793,355
2002	6,528	(4,182)			3,795,701
2003	13,672	(25,200)		•	3,784,173
9/30/2004	24,484	(19,195)			3,789,462

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-17

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request City 1-17

Please provide the accumulated depreciation relating to street lighting as recorded on the books from the Company's records, at year-end, for each year, 1941 to the present.

Response

Please refer Attachment City-1-15, for an approximate calculation of the accumulated depreciation relating to streetlighting equipment for each year since 1941.

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-19
December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request City 1-19

Please provide the DPU-approved depreciation rates that were applied to streetlighting equipment in each year, 1943 to the present (referred to in the Vaughan Affidavit, paragraph 12). If this is different from the depreciation rates listed in response to questions 7, please explain any such difference.

Response

Please refer to the Company's response to Information Request City-1-7 for a discussion of the depreciation rates used by the Company.

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-21

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request City 1-21

Please specify at what year, the Company started accounting for depreciation expense and accumulated depreciation separately for sub accounts within Account 373 (e.g., 632, 633, 634, 635, 636).

Response

As discussed in the Company's response to Information Request City-1-7, the calculation of depreciation expense was done on a sub-account basis until 1999. At that point, the Company switched to a streetlighting composite depreciation rate. The Company has never accounted for accumulated depreciation by sub-account. Please see the Company's response to Information Requests City-1-29 and DTE-1-11 for a discussion of how Iowa curves are used to allocated the total streetlight accumulated depreciation to the individual sub-accounts and vintages.

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-23

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request City 1-23

Please document the Company's calculation for the books in each of the years 1990-1994 of the accumulated depreciation relating to streetlighting (as described in the Vaughan Affidavit, paragraphs 12-14). Include data, assumptions and workpapers.

Response

Please refer to the Company's response to Information Request City-1-15.

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-24

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request City 1-24

Please document the Company's calculation for the books in each of the years 1943-1947 (or the earliest five years for which such data are available) of the accumulated depreciation relating to streetlighting (as described in the Vaughan Affidavit, paragraphs 12-14). Include data, assumptions and workpapers.

Response

Please refer to the Company's response to Information Request City-1-15.

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-25

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine Vaughan

Information Request City 1-25

Please provide the Company's calculation of the total streetlighting depreciation expense and change in total accumulated depreciation between December 31, 2003 and September 30, 2004, as reflected in Exhibit NSTAR-2.

Response

The following is the calculation of streetlighting depreciation expense for the nine months ending September 30, 2004.

	Dollars in Thousands
Beginning Plant Investment	\$ 3,784
Plus Estimated Net Additions/2	<u>\$417</u>
Total Depreciation Base	\$4,201
Depreciation Rate	<u>6.29%</u>
Annual Deprecation Amount	<u>\$ 264</u>
Nine Mos. Ending September, Depreciation Expense (\$264	x .75) <u>\$ 198</u>

Since NSTAR uses a mid-year convention to calculate depreciation expense, there is a depreciation expense true-up in December to reflect the actual net additions for the year divided by 2. Any adjustment for the over or under accrual of depreciation expense is typically included as part of the December expense.

The following is the calculation of the change in street lighting accumulated depreciation for the nine months ending September 30, 2004.

•	Dollars in Thousands
Beginning Accumulated Depreciation 1/1/04	\$1,565
Plus: Depreciation Expense (9 Mos. September)	198
Less: Retirements (9 Mos. September)	19
Less: Negative Net Salvage (9 Mos. September)	22
Ending Accumulated Depreciation 9/30/04	<u>\$1,722</u>

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-26

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request City 1-26

Separately for each line of Exhibit NSTAR-2, please provide the calculation of the depreciation expense and change in accumulated depreciation between December 31, 2003 and September 30, 2004.

Response

The Company is unable to fully respond to this question because it is based on an incorrect premise. The Company does not record depreciation expense by sub-account or vintages. See Information Request City 1-25 for the calculation for depreciation expense and the change in accumulated depreciation between December 31, 2003 and September 30, 2004.

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-28

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request City 1-28

Please provide the derivation of depreciation reserve for each line of Exhibit NSTAR-2, including assumptions, calculations, and workpapers.

Response

Please see the Company's response to Information Request City-1-27.

Information Request: City 1-30

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request City 1-30

Please document in detail with supporting spreadsheets and workpapers how Iowa curves were used to determine accumulated depreciation (as stated in the Exhibit CAM-4, July 28, 2003 e-mail, page 2).

Response

The Company is unable to fully respond to this question since it rests on an incorrect premise. The referenced email did not say that Iowa curves determined the total accumulated depreciation. The discussion in that email was an attempt to help the City understand that utilities do not depreciate individual units of mass property and also do not record accumulated depreciation related to each individual unit of mass property. As discussed in the Company's response to Information Request DTE-1-1, the Iowa curves do not affect the total streetlight equipment accumulated depreciation, only the allocation of that total to the individual vintage years.

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: City 1-31

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request City 1-31

Regarding the \$1,907 of Additions in 1943 (in Exhibit CAM-3), please calculate accumulated depreciation as of the year-end 2003 under the following hypotheticals (identifying and making any additional assumptions necessary for these three calculations):

- (1) all 1943 equipment except the \$138.02 remaining in 2003 was retired in 1983
- (2) all 1943 equipment except the \$138.02 remaining in 2003 was retired in 1963.
- (3) all 1943 equipment except the \$138.02 remaining in 2003 was retired in 1944.

Response

Attachment City-1-31 that performs the above requested calculations showing following accumulated depreciation amounts and assuming flat 15% negative net salvage as discussed in the Company's response to Information Request City-1-15:

(1)	\$2,880	See Attachment City-1-31, Page 1
(2)	\$762	See Attachment City-1-31, Page 2
(3)	\$(1,409)	See Attachment City-1-31, Page 3

					1983						
								Dep	preciation		Net Plant
					Adjustm			Annua		ccumulate	
•	Year	Additions Re				alance			Salvage		System
		[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	. [11]	[8]	[9]
	Beginning B	Вајапсе				0		-		-	-
	1942						6.46%	•		•	-
	1943	1,907				•	6.46%	62		62	1,845
	1944					,	6.46%	123	•	185	1,722
	1945						6.46%	123	-	308	1,599
•	1946				i	1,907	6.46%	123	-	431	1,476
	1947				1	1,907	6.46%	123	-	554	1,353
•	1948						6.46%	123	-	677	1,229
	1949				1	1,907	6.46%	123	-	801	1,106
	1950				1	1,907	6.46%	123	-	924	983
	1951				1	1,907	6.46%	123	-	1,047	860
	1952				j	1,907	6.46%	123	-	1,170	737
	1953					1,907	6.46%	123	-	1,293	613
	1954					1,907	6.46%	123	-	1,417	490
	1955						6.46%	123	_	1,540	367
	1956						6.46%	123	_	1,663	244
	1957					-	6.46%	123	-	1,786	121
	1958						6.46%	123	_	1,909	(2)
	1959						6.46%	123	_	2,032	(126)
	1960						6.46%	123	-	2,052	(249)
							6.46%	123	-		(372)
· · · · · · ·	1961						6,46%			2,279	
	1962					•		123	-	2,402	(495)
	1963						6,46%	123	-	2,525	(618)
_	1964						6.46%	123	•	2,648	(742)
	1965						6.46%	123	-	2,772	(865)
	1966						6.46%	123	-	2,895	(988)
	1967						6.46%	123	-	3,018	(1,111)
	1968					1,907	6.46%	123	•	3,141	(1,234)
	1969					1,907	6.46%	123	-	3,264	(1,357)
	1970					1,907	6.46%	123	-	3,387	(1,481)
	1971					1,907	6.46%	123	-	3,511	(1,604)
	1972					1,907	6.46%	123	-	3,634	(1,727)
	1973					1,907	6,46%	123	_	3,757	(1,850)
	1974						6.46%	123	_	3,880	(1,973)
	1975					-	6.46%	123	•	4,003	(2,097)
	1976						6.46%	123	_	4,127	(2,220)
	1977						5.00%	95		4,222	(2,315)
	1978						5.00%	95		4,317	(2,410)
	1979						5.00%	95		4,413	(2,506)
						-	5,00%	95			
	1980									4,508	(2,601)
	1981					1,907		95		4,603	(2,696)
	1982		(- m·				5.00%	95		4,699	(2,792)
	1983		(1,769)				5.00%	51		2,715	(2,578)
	1984						5.00%	7		2,722	(2,584)
	1985						5.00%	7		2,729	(2,591)
	1986						4.50%	6		2,735	(2,598)
	1987					138		6		2,742	(2,604)
	1988					138		6		2,748	(2,610)
	1989					138	4.50%	6		2,754	(2,616)
	1990						4.50%	6		2,760	(2,622)
	1991						6.10%	8		2,769	(2,631)
•	1992					138		9	ı	2,777	(2,639)
	1993						6.29%	9		2,786	(2,648)
	1994						6.29%	9		2,795	(2,657)
	1995						6.29%	9		2,803	(2,665)
							6.29%	9		2,812	(2,674)
	1996										
	1997						6.29%	9		2,821	(2,683)
	1998						6.29%	9		2,829	(2,691)
	1999						6.29%	9		2,838	(2,700)
	2000						6.29%	9		2,847	(2,709)
	2001					138		9		2,855	(2,717)
	2002						6.29%	9)	2,864	(2,726)
	2003						6,29%	9)	2,873	(2,735)
	Sep04						6.29%	7	,	2,880	(2,742)
	•									•	

						1963					
						_		Depre	ciation		Net Plant
					Adjustme		_		-	ccumulat	
	Year	Additions Re				Balance	Rate		Salvage	ed	System
	Davi.	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[11]	[8]	[9]
	1942	ning Balance				0	6.46%	-		-	-
	1942	1,907				1,907	6.46%	62		62	1,845
	1943	1,907				1,907	6.46%	123		185	1,722
	1945					1,907	6.46%	123	-	308	1,599
	1946					1,907	6.46%	123	-	431	1,476
	1947					1,907	6.46%	123	-	554	1,353
	1948					1,907	6.46%	123		677	1,229
	1949					1,907	6.46%	123	_	801	1,106
	1950					1,907	6,46%	123	-	924	983
	1951					1,907	6.46%	123	_	1,047	860
	1952					1,907	6.46%	123	_	1,170	737
	1953					1,907	6.46%	123	-	1,293	613
	1954					1,907	6.46%	123	•	1,417	490
•	1955					1,907	6.46%	123	-	1,540	367
	1956					1,907	6.46%	123	-	1,663	244
	1957					1,907	6.46%	123	-	1,786	121
	1958					1,907	6.46%	123	-	1,909	(2)
	1959					1,907	6,46%	123	-	2,032	(126)
	1960					1,907	6,46%	123	-	2,156	(249)
	1961					1,907	6.46%	123	-	2,279	(372)
•	1962					1,907	6.46%	123	•	2,402	(495)
	1963		(1,769)			138	6.46%	66	(265)	434	(296)
	1964					138	6.46%	9	-	443	(305)
	1965					138	6.46%	9	-	452	(314)
	1966					138	6.46%	9	-	460	(323)
	1967					138	6.46%	9	-	469	(332)
	1968					138	6.46%	9	. •	478	(340)
	1969					138	6.46%	9	-	487	(349)
	1970					138	6.46%	9	-	496	(358)
	1971					138	6.46%	9	-	505	(367)
	1972					138	6.46%	9	-	514	(376)
	1973					138	6.46%	9	-	523	(385)
	1974					138	6.46%	9	•	532	(394)
	1975					138	6.46%	9	-	541	(403)
	1976					138	6.46%	9	-	549 556	(412)
	1977					138	5.00%	7	-	556	(419)
	1978					138	5.00%	7	-	563	(425)
	1979					138	5.00%	7	•	570	(432)
·	1980					138	5.00%	7	-	577 594	(439)
	1981					138	5.00%	7	-	584 501	(446)
	1982					138	5,00%	7	-	591 598	(453)
	1983					138	5.00%	7	-		(460)
	1984					138	5.00%	7	-	605	(467)
	1985					138	5.00%	7	-	611	(474)
	1986					138 138	4.50%	6		618 624	(480)
	1987						4.50%	6		624	(486)
	1988					138 138	4.50%	6			(492) (498)
	1989					138	4.50% 4.50%	6 6		636 642	(505)
	1990 1991					138	6.10%	8	•	651	(513)
	1991					138	6.29%	9		660	(522)
	1992					138	6.29%	9		668	(530)
	1994					138	6.29%	9		677	(539)
	1995					138	6.29%	9		686	(548)
	1996					138	6.29%	9		694	(556)
	1990					138	6.29%	9		703	(565)
	1997					138	6.29%	9		703	(574)
	1999					138	6,29%	9		720	(582)
	2000					138	6.29%	9		720 729	(591)
	2000					138	6.29%	9		738	(600)
	2001					138	6.29%	9		746	(608)
	2002					138	6.29%	9		755	(617)
	Sep0					138	6.29%	7		762	(624)
	Dopo.	•					2.2370	,			(52.7)

	_		
- 1	9	4	4

			1944		Depre	ciation		Net Plant
			Adjustme				Accumul	
	Year	Addition etiremen Transfers	nt Balance	Rate	Annual	Salvage	ated	System
	1000	[1] [2] [3]	[4] [5]	[6]	[7]	[11]	[8]	[9]
	Beginnin	ng Balance	0	K-1	-	17	-	-
	1942		0	6.46%	_		_	
	1943	1,907	1,907	6.46%	62		62	1,845
	1944	(1,769)	138	6.46%	66	(265)	(1,907)	2,045
	1945	(1,705)	138	6.46%	9	(200)	(1,898)	2,036
	1946		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,889)	2,027
				6.46%	9	-		
	1947		138			-	(1,880)	2,018
	1948		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,871)	2,009
	1949		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,862)	2,000
	1950		138	6.46%	9	•	(1,853)	1,991
	1951		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,844)	1,982
	1952		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,835)	1,973
	1953		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,827)	1,964
	1954		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,818)	1,956
	1955		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,809)	1,947
	1956		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,800)	1,938
	1957		138	6,46%	9	-	(1,791)	1,929
•	1958		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,782)	1,920
	1959		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,773)	1,911
	1960		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,764)	1,902
	1961		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,755)	1,893
	1962		138	6,46%	9	_	(1,746)	1,884
	1963		138	6.46%	9		(1,738)	1,875
	1964		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,729)	1,866
	1965		138	6,46%	9	_	(1,720)	1,858
	1966		138	6.46%	9		(1,711)	1,849
	1967		138	6.46%	9	_	(1,702)	1,840
	1968		138	6,46%	ý	_	(1,693)	1,831
	1969		138	6,46%	9	-	(1,684)	1,822
					9	•	(1,675)	
*	1970		138	6.46%		•		1,813
	1971		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,666)	1,804
	1972		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,657)	1,795
	1973		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,649)	1,786
	1974		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,640)	1,777
	1975		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,631)	1,769
	1976		138	6.46%	9	-	(1,622)	1,760
	1977		138	5.00%	7	-	(1,615)	1,753
	1978		138	5.00%	7		(1,608)	1,746
	1979		138	5.00%	7	-	(1,601)	1,739
	1980		138	5.00%	7	-	(1,594)	1,732
	1981		138	5.00%	7	-	(1,587)	1,725
	1982		138	5.00%	7	-	(1,580)	1,718
	1983		138	5.00%		-	(1,574)	1,711
	1984		138	5.00%	7	-	(1,567)	1,705
	1985		138	5.00%	7	-		1,698
	1986		138	4.50%			(1,554)	1,691
	1987		138	4.50%			(1,547)	1,685
			138	4.50%			(1,541)	1,679
	1988							
	1989		138	4,50%			(1,535)	1,673
	1990		138	4.50%			(1,529)	1,667
	1991		138	6.10%			(1,520)	1,658
	1992		138	6.29%			(1,512)	1,650
	1993		138	6.29%			(1,503)	1,641
	1994		138	6.29%			(1,494)	
	1995		138	6.29%			(1,486)	1,624
	1996		138	6.29%			(1,477)	
	1997		138	6.29%			(1,468)	1,606
	1998		138	6.29%			(1,460)	
	1999		138	6.29%			(1,451)	
	2000		138	6.29%			(1,442)	
	2001		138	6.29%			(1,434)	
			138	6.29%			(1,434)	
•	2002							
	2003		138	6.29%			(1,416)	
	Sep04		. 138	6.29%	7		(1,409)	1,547
					_			

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: **DTE 1-2**

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request DTE-1-2

Refer to the Affidavit of Christine L. Vaughan at 2, ¶ 9. Provide complete and detailed documentation to demonstrate and explain the "original investment" in streetlighting equipment as shown on "the Company's books." Include all amounts and calculation include in determining the "original investment."

Response

The original investment is the cost incurred by the Company in installing the streetlighting equipment in that year. The Company follows the guidance provided by FERC in 18 CFR, part 101, Electric Plant Instructions in accumulating its original investment.

Please refer to the Company's response to Information Request City-1-1 for the amount of original investment in streetlighting equipment on the Company's books. The total of the column labeled "Cost" in Attachment City-11 (a) and (b) is the accumulated gross investment from the Company's Plant Account 373. The individual lines in the column show the remaining original investment from years 1943 to 2003 that are still on the books as of the valuation date.

The reference to "original investment" in the Affidavit of Christine L. Vaughan at 2, ¶ 9 could equally be phrased as "accumulated gross investment".

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: **DTE 1-3**

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request DTE-1-3

Refer to the Affidavit of Christine L, Vaughan at 3, ¶ 11. Provide the Department with the accumulated gross investment from the Company's Plant Account 373. Include all amounts and calculations included in determining the accumulated gross investment. Provide complete and detailed documentation to support your response.

Response

Please refer to Information Response DTE 1-2.

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: **DTE 1-5**December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request DTE-1-5

Refer to the Affidavit of Christine L. Vaughan at 3, ¶ 13. Provide the Department with the Company's records regarding accumulated depreciation as recorded in Account 108. Provide complete and detailed documentation to support your response.

Response

Please refer to the Company's response to Information Request City-1-9 for a detailed explanation of the factors that affect accumulated depreciation as recorded in Account 108. In addition, please refer to Attachment DTE-1-11(b) for document from the vendor of the Company's PowerPlant software that explains how accumulated depreciation is allocated to vintage years. Please refer to the Company's response to Information City-1-15 for the calculation of accumulated depreciation. Please refer to the following table for a summary of the net book value of streetlighting equipment calculated by the Company, and approved by the Department in each of its past base rate cases during the period 1973 to 1992. Also included in the table is a summary of the book values for the years 2000 to 2003 for reference purposes. Please refer to Attachment DTE-1-5 for copies of the Company's record of accumulated depreciation for the years 2000 – 2003.

Table 1			 	
Cambridge Street	ighting Equipment - Dolla	ars in Thousands		
	Boo	ok Depreciation	Net Book	
Year	Plant Balance	Reserve	Value	Source
Col A	Col B	Col C	Col D = Col B- Col C	
Dec.31, 1973	1,225	361	864	1973 Depreciation Study
Dec. 31, 1978	1,663	664	999	1978 Depreciation Study
Dec. 31, 1986	2,266	727	1,539	1986 Depreciation Study
Dec. 31, 1991	2,793	398	2,396	1992 Depreciation Study
Jun. 30, 1992	2,890	469	2,422	1992 Depreciation Study
Dec. 31, 2000	3,788	934	2,854	From Company's Books
Dec. 31, 2001	3,793	1,157	2,636	From Company's Books
Dec. 31, 2002	3,796	1,389	2,406	From Company's Books
Dec. 31, 2003	3,784	1,566	2,218	From Company's Books

										Attachment DTE-1-5
		Montt	hly Depi oridge E	reciation Re lectric Ligh	Monthly Depreciation Reserve Activity Cambridge Electric Light Co. Year 2000			Startie	Starting Month: Jan/2000 Ending Month: Dec/2000	0007
Cambridge Electric Light Financial				nstar company	Ži ja					
Depr. Group		Beginning Reserve	Provision		Retirements	Cost of Removal	Salvage and Other Credits	Transfers and Adjustments	Loss / (Gain)	Ending Reserve
Former Com Companies 373 CEL Dist Street Lighting		\$730,066.00	\$237,	\$237,131.41	(\$33,293.01)	(\$15,618.50)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$933,904.40
Service .		\$730,066.00	\$237,	\$237,131.41	(\$33,293.01)	(\$15,618.50)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$933,904.40
	Company Total:	730,086.00	237,	237,131.41	(33,293.01)	(15,618.50)	00:0	0.00	0.00	933,904,40
	Grand Total:	\$730,066.00	\$237,	\$237,131.41	(\$33,293.01)	(\$15,618.50)	\$6.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$933,904.40
			·			•• •• •• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
Page 1 of 1				ă	Depr - 1033				•	12/16/2004 14:15

	Month Cambi	nly Depreciation	Monthly Depreciation Reserve Activity Cambridge Electric Light Co. Year 2001			Startin	Starting Month: Jan/2001 Ending Month: Dec/2001	2001 /2001
Cambridge Electric Light		Nstar Company	mpany					
Chancia			:			Transfers and		
Depr. Group	Beginning Reserve	Provision	Retirements	Cost of Removal	Other Credits	Agjustments	Loss / (Gain)	Enging Keserve
Former Com Companies 373 CEL Dist Street Lighting	\$933,904.40	\$235,833.00	(\$1,754.49)	(\$10,496.16)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,157,486.75
	\$933,904.40	\$235,833.00	(\$1,754.49)	(\$10,496.16)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,157,486.75
Company Total:	1: 933,904.40	235,833.00	(1,754.49)	(10,496.16)	0.00	000	0.00	1,157,486.75
Grand Total:	\$933,904.40	\$235,833.00	(\$1,754.49)	(\$10,496.16)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,157,486.75
		· ·						
Page 1 of 1			Depr - 1033					12/16/2004 14:16

Starting Month: Jan/2002 Ending Month: Dec/2002	Salvage and Transfers and Cost of Removal Other Credits Adjustments Loss / (Gain) Ending Reserve	00.02	\$0.00\$ 00.00\$	(1,481.16) 0.00 0.00 1,389,207.33	(\$1,481.16) \$0.00 \$0.00 \$1,389,207.33	
Monthly Depreciation Reserve Activity Cambridge Electric Light Co. Year 2002 Nstar Company	Retirements	.68 (\$4,180.94)	(\$4,180.94)	(4,180.94)	(\$4,180.94)	
Monthly Depre Cambridge Ele Ns	Beginning Reserve Provision				\$1,157,486.75 \$237,382.68	
Cambridge Electric Light	Financial Depr. Group	Former Com Companies 373 CEL Dist Street Lichting		Company Total:	Grand Total:	

	Mon	ithly Depreciation ibridge Electric	Monthly Depreciation Reserve Activity Cambridge Electric Light Co. Year 2003	. e		Startin	Starting Month: Jan/2003 Ending Month: Dec/2003	2003 72003
Cambridge Electric Light		Nstar Company	mpany				1	
Enancial					Salvage and	Transfers and		
Depr. Group	Beginning Reserve	Provision	Retirements	Cost of Removal	Other Credits	Adjustments	Loss / (Gain)	Ending Reserve
Former Com Combanies 373 CEL Dist Street Lighting	\$1,389,207.33	\$238,387.08	(\$25,200.08)	(\$1,382.12)	\$0.00	(\$35,588.92)	\$0.00	\$1,565,422.29
	\$1,389,207.33	\$238,387.08	(\$25,200.08)	(\$1,382.12)	\$0.00	(\$35,589.92)	\$0.00	\$1,585,422.29
Company Total:	1,389,207.33	238,387.08	(25,200.08)	(1,382.12)	0.00	(35,589.92)	0.00	1,565,422.29
Grand Total:	\$1,389,207.33	\$238,387.08	(\$25,200.08)	(\$1,382.12)	\$0.00	(\$35,589.92)	\$0.00	\$1,565,422.29
Page 1 of 1			Depr 1033					12/16/2004 14:17

Cambridge Electric Light Company
Department of Telecommunications and Energy
D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: DTE 1-9

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request DTE-1-9

Refer to the Amended Answer to Respondent Cambridge Electric Light Company, at 2, ¶ 6. Explain and provide an example of how CELC's method for determining the purchase price of streetlighting equipment may assign a negative value to streetlights. Provide complete and detailed documentation to support your response.

Response

Please refer to the Company's response to Information Request DTE-1-5, specifically Attachment DTE-1-5, for a detailed discussion of how the allocation of depreciation reserve to individual vintages may result in negative values for some lights. As stated in one of the notes on page 2 of the attachment "...Because the "remaining reserve to allocate" may cross zero some vintage factors can be positive while others can be negative." For a more practical example, please refer to Exhibit NSTAR-2 in which streetlighting equipment installed in 1943 through 1947 do, in fact, have negative values. Please also refer to the Company's response to Information Request DTE-1-11 for more explanation on Iowa curve methodology.

Cambridge Electric Light Company Department of Telecommunications and Energy

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: DTE 1-10

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Information Request DTE-1-10

In <u>Petition of the City of Waltham</u>, D.T.E. 02-11, at 6 (2002) the Department directed distribution companies to submit in all streetlight dispute proceedings schedules that demonstrate, by year, additions, retirements, net balance, average balance, depreciation rate, depreciation expense, negative salvage value and accumulated depreciation of the following accounts:

- (1) Street Light OH Conductors (Acct. 632);
- (2) Street Light Underground Conduit (Acct. 633);
- (3) Street Light Underground Conductors (Acct. 634);
- (4) Municipal Post, Fixtures, Luminaries (Acct. 635);
- (5) Commercial Posts, Fixtures, Luminaries (Acct. 636); and
- (6) Outdoor Street Light Transformers and Control Equipment (Acct. 637).

Using data for the City of Cambridge, please provide these schedules in the identical format (and columns) shown in Exh. W-4 of D.T.E. 02-11 (attached). In the columns entitled "depreciation rates" apply Department-approved depreciation rates for each year.

Response

Please refer to the Company's response to Information Request City-1-13 for the requested information.

Cambridge Electric Light Company
Department of Telecommunications and Energy

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: DTE 1-11

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Page 1 of 3

Information Request DTE-1-11

Refer to Exh. CAM-4, at 2 of 3. The Company refers to its use of Iowa curves using an example of a person born in 1920 to explain its "convention for spreading remaining book value of the plant over the expected remaining average service life."

- a) Explain how does the example applies to streetlighting plant that may have reached its useful life and has been fully depreciated, and has already been recovered through rates but is still in use.
- b) Is the method the Company is using to value the streetlighting plant in this example a "theoretical" depreciation method?
- c) Is the Company using a composite distribution plant depreciation rate to calculate the purchase price?

Provide complete and detailed documentation to support your responses.

Response

a) This concept is best explained by a hypothetical example.

Please refer to Attachment DTE-1-11 (a), Table 1 where a hypothetical example of five streetlights is depreciated individually. Note that in most cases, the age of the streetlights is lower than the expected service life and the lights have a positive net book value. In the case of streetlight #5, it is older than the expected service life and has a negative net book value. This is a reasonable hypothetical methodology for illustrative purposes but is impractical when thousands of items are included. In fact, if the Company did develop separate depreciation rates for each individual asset, the 30 year old asset would not be depreciated more than its original cost.

Assume that these same five streetlights are accounted for as mass property with a composite depreciation rate of 4.38 percent. Further assume that, for simplicity, there is no net salvage associated with these lights. Table 2 shows the resulting total accumulated depreciation at the same point in time. Therefore, before rates are changed and Iowa curves used, the Company has expensed \$ 788 of depreciation on the \$1,000 worth of assets, leaving \$212 remaining to be depreciated.

At the time that new rates are established, the average remaining service

Cambridge Electric Light Company
Department of Telecommunications and Energy
D.T.F. 04.65

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: DTE 1-11

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Page 2 of 3

life for streetlights is re-estimated. Assume that an expert looked at the five remaining streetlights and determined that they are lasting much longer than originally anticipated. Streetlight #5 which is 30 years old still has another 2 years of life. Streetlights #1 to 3 are expected to last another two years over their original life estimates. Table 3 shows the hypothetical change in service life. Therefore, instead of an average service life of 22 years, the equipment is now estimated to have an average service life of 24 years.

As a result of the change in estimate of the service life, the remaining total of \$212 that was to be depreciated on average for another 4 years (22 years of old service life – 18 years age) is now to be depreciated on average for another 6 years (24 new estimate of service life – 18 years average age). This is what we refer to as the "convention for spreading remaining book value of the plant over the expected remaining average service life."

Note that this does not change what was collected in depreciation to date. In both cases, \$788 of depreciation was recorded. Only the rate of recognition of depreciation going forward is changed. The new rate of 3.5 percent better matches the expense of the assets over their in-service lives.

In reality, the individual contributions to net book value are not known at the time of rate setting. All that is known is the total accumulated depreciation to date and the total initial cost. The total accumulated depreciation is allocated to each streetlight vintage through the Iowa curve methodology. Table 4 uses the methodology to allocate the \$788 of accumulated depreciation to each of the vintage years. The formulas used are described in Attachment DTE-1-11 (b). In this example we use formula I(A) for the single depreciation group and the case where the reserve is less than or equal to the plant balance. The figures in Col G show the resulting allocated accumulated depreciation for each vintage.

A further example of how this methodology works can be demonstrated by examining the effect of the methodology on streetlight #5. This streetlight outlived its original expected service life. It is more than fully depreciated, where the amount collected through rates is greater than its original cost. Streetlight #5 contributed negative \$63 to the total net book value of \$212 prior to the rate setting and Iowa curve allocation (although this amount was not known during the process). After the Iowa curve allocation process, it now contributes negative \$66 to the total net book

Cambridge Electric Light Company
Department of Telecommunications and Energy

D.T.E. 04-65

Information Request: DTE 1-11

December 17, 2004

Respondent: Christine L. Vaughan

Page 3 of 3

value of \$212. Going forward, the Company would apply the new depreciation rate of 3.5 percent, making a further negative contribution to the total net book value.

- b) The Company's method does not compute a "theoretical" depreciation expense, nor does it compute a "theoretical" accumulated depreciation reserve as the City's method would have us do. The depreciation expense and accumulated depreciation on the Company's books are real values reflective of exactly what the Company has recorded for accounting purposes.
- c) The Company does not use a composite distribution plant depreciation rate. Only Department-approved, streetlight specific rates were used when depreciating streetlighting equipment.

Hypothetical Example of Five Streetlights

Table 1 - Individua I	nitial Cost	Age	Expected Service Life	% Depreciated	Depreciation	Net Book Value Col F
_	Col A	Col B	Col C	Col D	Col E	
Streetlight #1	200	10	15	67%	133	6
Streetlight #2	100	15	20	75%	75	2
Streetlight #3	300	15	25	60%	180	12
Streetlight #4	200	20	25	80%	160	4
Streetlight #5	200	30	<u>25</u>	120%	<u>240</u>	<u>-4</u> 21
Total	1000				788	21
Average		18	22			
Col D = Col B/Col	С					
Col E = Col D * Co	alΑ					
Col F = Col A - Co	l F					

ŕ	Initial Cost Col A	Age Col B	Depreciation Rate Col C	Yearly Depreciation Col D	Total Accumulated Depreciation Col E	Net Book Value Col F
Streetlight #1	200	10	4,38%	9	88	11:
Streetlight #2	100	15	4.38%	4	66	3
Streetlight #3	300	15	4.36%	13	197	10
Streetlight #4	200	20	4.38%	9	175	2
Streetlight #5	200	<u>30</u>	4.38%	9		<u>-6</u> 21
Total	1000				788	21
Аvегаде		18				
Col D = Col A *	Col C					
Col E = Col D 1	Col B					
Col F = Col A -	Col F					

	Initial Cost Col A	Age Col B	Old Expected Service Life Col C	New Expected Service Life Col D	Total Accumulated Depreciation Col E	Net Book Value Col F
Streetlight #1	200	10	15	17		
Streetlight #2	100	15	20	22		
Streetlight #3	300	15	25	27		
Streetlight #4	200	20	25	22		
Streetlight #5	200	30	<u>25</u>	<u>32</u>		
Total	1000				788	21:
Average		18	22	24		
Col D = new es	stimate			Amount to collec	212 a	ssumes 0 net salvage
	ccumulated to dat	e (Table 3)		Years remaining		ol D-Col B
Col F = Col A -				% depreciation	3.5% C	of F/(Col A*(Col D-ColB)

le 4 - lows C	urve Allocation N	tethodology	S=0		Rb= 788	
ume year is:		itoti iodology	-			Allocated
unite year is.	2000					Accumulated
Vintage		Initial Cost	Av	Pv	(Pv *Av)	Depreciation
Col A	Col B	Col C	Col D	Col E	Col F	Col_G
1970	Steetlight #5	200	29.5	200	5900	266
1980	Streetlight #4	200	19.5	200	3900	176
1985	Streetlight #3	300				
	Streetlight #2	<u>100</u>				
	Total	400	14.5	400	5800	261
1990	Streetlight #1	<u>200</u>	9.5	<u>200</u>	<u>1900</u>	86
	Total	1000			17500	781

	Initial Cost Col A	Age Col B	New Expected Service Life Col D	Total Accumulated Depreciation Col E	Net Book Value Col F
Streetlight #1	200	10	17	86 ,	11-
Streetlight #2	100	15	22	ļ	
Streetlight #3	300	15	27	261	13
Streetlight #4	200	20	22	176	2
Streetlight #5	200	<u>30</u>	<u>32</u>	<u> 266</u>	<u>-6</u> 21
Total	1000	_		788	21
Average		18	24		

MEMORANDUM

PowerPlan Consultants, Inc.

1600 Parkwood Circle Suite 600 Atlanta, Georgia 30339 770-859-0402

TO:

Larry Poore

FROM:

Mark Heinemann

SUBJECT:

PowerPlant Depreciation

DATE:

November 14, 2000

In the utility industry, group depreciation is used for most assets. This is done by applying a composite rate to assets in all vintages in a class, usually a FERC account. The rate takes into account the average expected life, a mortality dispersion curve, and the age of the individual assets. This method produces the most accurate depreciation results, since each asset is depreciated over its actual life, some shorter than the average and some much longer. For example, if a pole has an average life of 30 years, an individual pole may already be 40 years old. Its expected life is not 30 years, but given that it has already lasted 40 years, its expected life may be 46 years (computed from a mortality curve). Thus we would expect to find it 40/46 percent depreciated. Of course there are minor reserve imbalances that occur from time to time. PowerPlant uses these remaining life computations (theoretical reserve) to accurately allocate the actual reserve to all the corresponding assets and vintages. The attached document outlines the computation.

Depreciation Reserve Allocation Methodology

During each month end close the PowerPlant CPR reserve allocation factors, or reserve ratios, are calculated to provide quick reporting of net book value (NBV) for assets. There are two methodologies used in calculating the factors: (I) Dollar-Age weighting is the default methodology, and (II) Theoretical Reserve Allocation is used whenever a mortality curve and average service life is supplied on a depreciation method (If the "End of Life" field is populated it will be used as the truncation date). Both methodologies are based on a Depreciation Group Vintage Summary, which is the CPR plant for each depreciation group-vintage combination. Therefore, any asset's allocated reserve is the plant balance multiplied by the allocation factor for the asset's depreciation group and vintage.

Equations (for a single depreciation group):

Dollar-Age Reserve Allocation Factors: $F_* = R_*/P_v$ (I)

= Vintage Plant Balance

= Vintage (Age) Allocated Reserve

(A) Reserve <= Plant:

$$R_{\tau} = \frac{P_{v} \cdot A_{\tau}}{\sum_{r} [P_{v} \cdot A_{v}]} \cdot R_{b}$$

process oldest vintages until $R_v \le P_v \cdot (1 - S_n)$

(B) Reserve > Plant:

$$R_{v} = \left(\frac{P_{v} \cdot A_{v}}{\sum_{v} \left[P_{v} \cdot A_{v}\right]} \cdot R_{z}\right) + \left(P_{v} \cdot \left(1 - S_{n}\right)\right)$$

(C) Opposite signs:

$$R_{v} = \frac{P_{v} \cdot A_{v}}{\sum [P_{v} \cdot A_{v}]} \cdot R_{b}$$

without limits on R.

where S_n = Net Salvage Rate

$$A_v = (year - vin - 0.5) + \frac{month}{12} = Age (half-year convention)$$

R_b = Total Actual (Booked) Reserve

$$R_x = R_b - \sum_{\alpha} [P_{\alpha} \cdot (1 - S_{\alpha})] = \text{Excess Reserve}$$

NOTE:

- When total reserve exceeds total plant (either both positive or both negative) for a depreciation group, all vintages will be fully reserved with at least a factor equal to one.
- When the signs for total reserve and total plant do not match (one is negative, the other is positive), a straight weighting is done across vintages without checking for the fully reserved condition. Because the "remaining reserve to allocate" may cross zero some vintage factors can be positive while others can be negative. Also, the factors can potentially become many times greater than one for individual vintages
- When year = vintage $A_{c} = \frac{month}{24}$

Depreciation Reserve Allocation Methodology

(II) Theoretical Reserve Allocation Factors:

$$F_v = F_i + F_a$$

$$F_r = F_v + (F_u \cdot M)$$

where F. = Vintage Theoretical Factor

F. = Theoretical Factor (see "Theoretical Factor Calculation")

 $F_{\rm m} = (F_{\rm rel} - F_{\rm r})/12$ = Theoretical monthly factor increment

M = Month of the year (January = 1, December = 12)

F₂ = Vintage Factor Adjustment (see A-C)

(A) Actual Reserve = Theoretical Reserve:

$$F_a = 0$$

(B) Actual Reserve > Theoretical Reserve:

(i)
$$F_a = k \sum_i [F_i \cdot (1 - F_i) \cdot (F_i)]$$

solve for k:

(ii)
$$k = \frac{R_b - R_c}{\sum [R_s \cdot (1 - F_c) \cdot (F_c)]}$$

if k is between -1 and 1 then use in (i) to calculate F_a ; otherwise iterate over (i) and (ii) substituting F_t with F_t :

(iii)
$$F_t = F_t \cdot (1 - F_t) \cdot (F_t)$$

(C) Actual Reserve < Theoretical Reserve:

$$F_a = \left(\frac{R_b}{R_t} - 1\right) \cdot F_r \cdot (1 - S_n)$$

$$R_v = \sum [P_v \cdot (1 - S_u) \cdot F_v] = Vintage Theoretical Reserve$$

$$R_t = \sum R_u = \text{Total Theoretical Reserve}$$

NOTE:

- Vintages that exceed the maximum life for the specified mortality curve and average service life with be given a Theoretical Reserve Factor (F_{*}) equal to one.
- Dollar-Age allocation is used if all vintages for a given depreciation group exceed the maximum life for the specified mortality curve and average service life.

Depreciation Reserve Allocation Methodology

Theoretical Factor (Fy) Calculation:

$$F_v = 1 - RL_f$$

(A) RLf for Whole Life:

$$RL_f = \frac{(RL\% \times \%Srv)}{10000}$$

where RL% = Remaining Life Percentage from curve data for current age
%Srv = Percent Surviving from curve data for current age

(B) RLf for Life Span (specified End of Life):

$$RL_f = \frac{(RL\% \times \%Srv) - (RL\%_T \times \%Srv_T)}{10000}$$

where RL% = Remaining Life Percentage from curve data for current age

%Srv = Percent Surviving from curve data for current age

RL%T = Remaining Life Percentage from curve data for truncation age

%Srv_T = Percent Surviving from curve data for truncation age